

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/719,076	11/21/2003	D. David Roberts	6045-006	2264	
75	90 06/01/2006		ЕХАМ	INER	
David G. Rosenbaum			CHIN, PAUL T		
Rosenbaum & A	•		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
650 Dundee Road Suite 380			3652		
Northbrook, IL 60062			DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006	. ·	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/719,076	ROBERTS, D. DAVID	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		
	PAUL T. CHIN	3652	:
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence ad	dress
Period for Reply			:
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of a period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION AT THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this co DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	:
Status			:
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 M	Parah 2006		;
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	·	•	
·	,	.,	
Disposition of Claims			:
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) $9,10$ and $14-18$ is/are pending in the	application.		:
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			:
6) Claim(s) <u>9,10 and 14-18</u> is/are rejected.			•
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		<u>:</u>
Application Papers			:
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		:
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 25 April 2005 is/are: a)		I to by the Examiner.	:
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) i	s objected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	xaminer. Note the attached Of	ifice Action or form PT	O-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	nriority under 35 I I S.C. & 11	9(a)-(d) or (f)	:
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	i priority drider 55 0.0.0. § 11	3(a)-(u) or (i).	:
1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority document		ication No.	,
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		Stage
application from the International Bureau	·		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	eived.	;
			:
Attachment(s)			!
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Sumi		i.
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 	#1 C	ail Date nal Patent Application (PTC	D-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	•	: :

Application/Control Number: 10/719,076 Page 2

Art Unit: 3652

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on February 28, 2006, has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 9,10,14, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniele (6,733,056) in view of Snedeker (774,994) (see PTO-892).

Daniele (6,733,056) discloses a handheld device comprising a planar base (fig. 1) having an open end, first and second lateral side walls (14,16) extending upwardly along the opposing sides of the planar base, an arcuate flange (21), which can be considered as an arcuate handle, forming a continuous curve from the planar base.

Daniele (6,733,056) does not show a close end. However, Snedeker (774,994) teaches a closed end member (5) to close the opening of the arcuate handle. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to provide a closed end on the both opening ends of the arcuate handle (21) of Daniele (6,733,056) as taught by Snedeker (774,994) to prevent debris from entering within the arcuate handle.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,076 Page:3

Art Unit: 3652

4. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniele (6,733,056) and Snedeker (774,994), as applied to claim 9, and further in view of Brownell (6,234,549) (See PTO-892).

Daniele, as presented above, does not show that the device is being made of stainless steel. However, Brownell (6,234,549) teaches a scoop having a blade being made of a stainless steel (Col. 7, lines 37-55). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to those skilled on the Daniele's device to be made of stainless stain as taught by Brownell (6,234,549) in order to provide a reliable device and also to prevent corrosion.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9,10, and 14-18 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PAUL T. CHIN whose telephone number is (571) 272-6922. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THURS (7:30 -6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, EILEEN LILLIS can be reached on (571) 272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/719,076

Art Unit: 3652

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PAUL T. CHIN Paulli
Examiner

Page 4

Art Unit 3652